



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

himself as the author? Unless indeed the colophon, "written by me," was intended as an announcement of authorship.

If Ramsay was the author of so considerable a poem, which went into print about 1508, and was reprinted twice in the sixteenth century, why does nobody speak of him as a poet, and why, at least from the time of Bellenden in the next generation, has the *Wallace* always been attributed to Blind Harry?

If Ramsay composed the *Wallace*, and enlarged, re-wrote, and modernized the *Bruce* to suit his taste, as he was (by the hypothesis) also the scribe of the Cambridge *Bruce*, the vocabularies and spelling should be identical. A slight and hasty examination shows that this is not the case. For instance:

B uses *ane* before both vowels and consonants; W before vowels only. The scribe of B has a predilection for the initial *g*, sixty-one words in the glossary beginning with that letter, to only eight in W.

*Manteme* (maintain), *bot and* (and also), *cowyne* (fraud), *owth* (above, beyond), *outta* (overtake), *angyr* (misery), *ynkerly* (constantly), *abaid* (tarrying), *apparaill* (apparatus), *out of daw* (slain), *schiltrum* (phalanx), *thusgat* (in this manner), common in B, are not found in W.

W has *fewtir* (socket for a spear) and *pissane* (neck armour, camail) not in B. *Lowdyane* (Lothian) in B is *Lowthiane* in W.

*Chenzies*, *oist* (*oyst*, *oost*), *maiss* (*mayss*), *pusoune*, *forouten* (*for-owtyn*) in B, are *chenys*, *ost*, *makis*, *poyson*, *with-owtyn* in W.

The impressions produced on my mind by previous reading of the *Bruce* and *Wallace* have been:

FIRST. That the *Wallace* is not the production of a wandering beggar, blind from birth, but of a man of reading and considerable literary skill, in possession of his eyesight.

SECOND. That the *Bruce* has been extensively tampered with by somebody between Wyntoun's time and the writing of the Cambridge MS.

These impressions are confirmed by Mr. Brown's researches.

On the other hand, I cannot see that he has adduced any *proof* that Ramsay was the author of the *Wallace* and the re-caster of the *Bruce*, though both suppositions are possible.

I quite agree with Mr. Brown that "J de R. capellanus" of the Cambridge *Bruce* (and another poem) is not, as Prof. Skeat supposes, another way of writing "Johannes Ramsay;" but I entirely dissent from his conjecture that Ramsay used the former signature to signify "John, Ross Herald." I strongly suspect that the assumption (by Prof. Skeat and others) that the handwriting of the two MSS. is identical, has been too hasty, and that the J. de R. of the Cambridge MS. is a different person from the Johannes Ramsay of the Edinburgh *Bruce* and *Wallace*.<sup>3</sup> That Dunbar's "Sir John the Ross" may refer to the Ross Herald (whoever he was) seems to me a plausible conjecture. I also fully agree with his views about the supposititious *Bruce*.

Mr. Brown deserves the thanks of students of the early Scottish literature for his careful examination of this highly interesting subject, which I trust will receive further investigation at the hands of some competent scholar.

WM. HAND BROWNE.

Johns Hopkins University.

### PROSODY.

*Studies from the Yale Psychological Laboratory.* Edited by EDWARD W. SCRIPTURE, Ph. D., Director of the Psychological Laboratory. Vol. VII. New Haven: 1899. 8vo, 108 pp.

THE larger part of this issue is occupied with Dr. Scripture's article, "Researches in Experimental Phonetics" (First Series, 101 pp.); the remainder with his paper entitled "Observations on Rhythmic Action." Of these the first is the only one we shall notice particularly.

According to Dr. Scripture, these studies were begun in October, 1897. The scope of such researches in general would include not only speech sounds as material for language, but also their changes resulting from different mental conditions, such as fatigue, emotion, and the like; it would also include the study of rhythm in speech, with its application in poetry and music. The present study is an attempt to use laboratory methods for the

<sup>3</sup> Prof. Skeat himself admits that the text of the two MSS. varies so much that they seem to have been copied from different sources. Certainly this looks as if they were by different scribes.

purpose of settling the controversy in regard to the quantitative character of English verse. The general field seems to the author so rich and so unexplored that there is unlimited gain for any one wishing to enter it, and he announces that to those wishing to use the same methods every possible facility will be afforded by the Yale laboratory.

The scope of the article may be estimated from the headings of its subdivisions:

- I. Apparatus for studying speech sounds.
  1. Making gramophone plates.
  2. Transcribing gramophone records.
- II. The diphthong *ai* found in the words *I, eye, die, fly, thy*.

This study was based upon a recital of the nursery rime of *Cock Robin*. The vowels in each of the above words are successively considered under the heads of (1) beginning, (2) pitch, (3) formation, (4) amplitude, (5) ending, (6) relation between curve and color; these are followed by general observations on *ai*.

- III. Study of the words "*Who'll be the parson?*"

- IV. The nature of vowels.

Under the latter head are successively treated (1) Willis's theory, (2) Helmholtz's theory, (3) comparison of the two theories, (4) the noise theory, (5) observations on the nature of spoken sounds, (6) mechanical action in producing vowels.

- V. The mouth-tone in vowels.

- VI. The cord-tone in vowels.

Subdivisions under this head are: (1) the pitch-function, (2) the amplitude function, (3) sequence of word-tones.

- VII. Verse-analysis of the first stanza of *Cock Robin*.

Under the last head the author's summary is as follows:

"These researches were begun in order to settle the controversy in regard to the quantitative character of English verse. A nursery rhyme was selected as being verse in the judgment of all classes of people for many ages. When compared with some of what many of us now consider to be the best verse, it shows various defects, but these defects are typical of the usual deviations from our present standards, and are, moreover, not defects according to other standards. It is also a fact that our notions of verse are largely derived from the rhymes heard in childhood. . . .

The elements in speech whose rhythmical arrangement is the essential of verse as contrasted with prose are: 1, quality; 2, duration or length; 3, pitch; and 4, intensity. The element of quality consists in the nature of the sound as a complex of tones and noises producing a definite effect as a speech-sound. Length, pitch, and intensity are properties of the speech-sound that can be varied without destroying its specific nature; that is, without changing the quality. These four elements can be varied independently.

It seems to be sufficiently well settled that, in addition to variations of quality, that is, of the speech-sounds, the essential change in Greek verse was one of pitch. I have observed a similar characteristic in Japanese verse. Probably no better way of getting an idea of the nature of Greek verse could be found than that of listening to typical Japanese verse. I have also found another form of pitch-verse in a kind of poetical dictionary used by the Turks for learning Persian.

Latin verse was essentially a time-verse, the chief distinction among the syllables being that of length in addition to the change in speech-sounds.

English verse is usually considered to be an intensity-verse, or a verse of loud and soft syllables. The four tables show quite evidently that English verse is also a pitch-verse and a time-verse.

It may be said that in all probability changes of length and intensity went along with the changes of pitch in Greek verse but that they were of minor importance. Perhaps, also, changes of pitch and intensity likewise accompanied the long and short syllables in Latin verse. But I do not think that for English verse we can fully accept the analogous statement that, although the changes in pitch and length may be present, they are quite subordinate to the changes in intensity. It would, I believe, be more nearly correct to say that English verse is composed of strong or weak, or emphatic and unemphatic syllables, and that strength can be produced by length, pitch, or intensity.

The usual scansion of this stanza in strong and weak syllables would give

— — — — —  
 — — — — —  
 — — — — —  
 — — — — —

The three elements: length, pitch, and intensity, are all used to produce strength. Thus the forcible vowel *u* in Line 1 is long and moderately high and loud.

The strength of a syllable may be kept the same by increasing one of the factors as another one decreases. The vowel *o* in *Robin* in Line 1 is strong on account of its length and intensity, although its pitch is low. A syllable

necessarily short may be made as strong as a longer one by making it louder or higher; or a syllable necessarily of small intensity may be strengthened by lengthening it or raising its pitch. Thus, the short *i* of *With* in Line 3 is strong on account of its high pitch and large amplitude; and the weak *e* of *arrow* in Line 3 is strong on account of its high pitch and its length. This might be called the *principle of substitution*.

An increase in the loudness, length, or pitch of a syllable renders it stronger—other things being equal. Using the symbol *f* to indicate dependence, we may put  $m=f(x, y, z)$ , where *m* is the measure of strength and *x*, *y*, and *z* are the measures of intensity, length, and pitch respectively. This might be called the fundamental *principle of strength*.

The study of this and other specimens of verse has made it quite clear that the usual concept of the nature of a poetical foot is erroneous in at least one respect. *Lines* in verse are generally distinct units, separated by pauses and having definite limits. A single line, however, is not made up of smaller units that can be marked off from each other. It would be quite erroneous to divide the first stanza of *Cock Robin* into feet as follow:

Who killed|Cock Robin?  
I, said the|sparrow,  
With my bow and ar|row  
I killed|Cock Rob|in.

No such divisions occur in the actually spoken sounds, and no dividing points can be assigned in the tracing.

The correct concept of the English poetical line seems to be that of a certain quantity of speech-sound distributed so as to produce an effect equivalent to that of a certain number of points of emphasis at definite intervals. The proper scansion of the above stanza would be:

Who killed Cock Robin?  
I, said the sparrow,  
With my bow and arrow  
I killed Cock Robin.

The location of a point of emphasis is determined by the strength of the neighboring sounds. It is like the centroid of a system of forces, or the center of gravity of a body, in being the point at which we can consider all the forces to be concentrated and yet have the same effect. The point of emphasis may lie even in some weak sound or in a mute consonant, if the distribution of the neighboring sounds produces an effect equivalent to a strong sound occurring at that point. Thus the first point of emphasis in the third line lies somewhere in the group of sounds *mybow*, probably between *y* and *o*.

With this view of the nature of English

verse all the stanzas of *Cock Robin* can be readily and naturally scanned as composed of two-beat or two-point lines.

It is not denied that much English verse shows the influence of quantitative classical models, but such an influence is evidently not present in *Cock Robin*."

It is evident that a wide perspective is opened up by these initial studies, and that students of English verse will do well to heed their significance. The results will of course vary with the mode of recitation, so that the personal equation can by no means be eliminated at the outset; and the same will probably be true in some measure of the interpretation of the tracings.

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

### FRENCH LITERATURE.

*Molière's Les Précieuses Ridicules*, by WALTER DALLUM TOY. Heath's Modern Language Series. Boston (Boards).

*Molière's Les Précieuses Ridicules*, by C. FONTAINE, B.L., L.D. Wm. R. Jenkins. New York (paper).

*Les Précieuses Ridicules* is especially serviceable for class use. To begin with, it is short (forty pages) and the narrative is lively while the comedy has a threefold historic interest in that (1) it is the great classic forerunner of French farce comedy; (2) it marks Molière's successful début in Paris; (3) it is a record (albeit in ridicule, and for this it is not the less valuable) of a curious phase of French literature not easily brought to the notice of the undergraduate in any other form.

Mr. Toy has apparently understood the unusual significance of the piece and accordingly divides his excellent introduction (ten pp.) into I, Molière; II, La Société Précieuse; III, Date and reception of the comedy; IV, Bibliographical note; V, Molière's preface.

Under these four sections the editor gives the historical setting of the play in brief and entertaining form.

His notes (ten pp.) are mainly historic, although they contain some suggestive linguistic points. They include the celebrated Carte de Iendre, in itself an amusing and instructive